

## Notes on Prajñāpāramitā texts:

### 2. The *Suvikrāntavikrāmipariṣcchā*

J. W. de Jong

The Sanskrit text of the *Suvikrāntavikrāmipariṣcchā* (abbr. *Su.*) was published in 1956 by Matsumoto and in 1958 by Hikata. Conze has given a summary of the contents in *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature* ('s-Gravenhage, 1960, pp. 60–62). The vocabulary has been carefully studied by him in his *Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature* (Tokyo, 1967). Recently two translations have been published. Conze's translation is to be found in *The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts* (London, 1973, pp. 1–78) and a Japanese translation by Tosaki Hiromasa in *Daijō butten*, vol. 1 (Tōkyō, 1973, p. 73–296, 304–316, 325–329).

According to Conze the *Su.* is the latest in time of the full-scale Prajñāpāramitā texts and must be earlier than A.D. 625 since Candrakīrti quotes it in his *Madhyamakāvatāra*.<sup>1</sup> Hikata puts the *terminus ante quem* in the beginning of the sixth century because Bhāvaviveka (c. 490–570) quotes it in his *Prajñāpradīpa-Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* (cf. Hikata pp. lxxvi and lxxxii). However, all passages quoted by Bhāvaviveka are from one chapter only (chapter III) and it is therefore not possible to maintain that the entire text existed already in the beginning of the sixth century.

The editions of the Sanskrit text are based upon a single manuscript from the Cambridge University Library. According to Bendall the manuscript was written in the 12–13th centuries. It is therefore much later than the Chinese translation (660–663, cf. T. 2154, ch. 8, p. 555b) and the Tibetan translation by Śīlendrabodhi, Jinamitra and Ye-śes-sde (c. 800–825). The Sanskrit text is much closer to the Tibetan translation than to the Chinese translation. This is partly due to the fact that Hsüan-tsang has not always translated the text literally; in many instances he has given a paraphrase in order to bring out more clearly the meaning of the text. Moreover, Hsüan-tsang's translation is influenced by the rhythm of the Chinese sentence which consists of groups of four characters. On the other hand it is obvious that the Sanskrit text, as represented by the Cambridge manuscript, has been subjected to

changes and corruptions. A great number of these must have been in existence already in the manuscript used by the Tibetan translators in the beginning of the ninth century. Finally, the Tibetan translation seems not to have been made with the same care as translations of other P.P. texts.

In several places the divergences between the three recensions are so great that it is very difficult to arrive at the meaning of the original text. In these cases it is impossible to establish the exact wording by emendations of the Sanskrit text. This is true for instance of pp. 7.9–8.16 (all references are to page and line of Hikata's edition). Tosaki translates the Sanskrit text but adds in a note a translation of both the Tibetan and the Chinese versions. However, even when the Sanskrit text agrees with the Tibetan translation and not with the Chinese translation, it is not always possible to assume that the text is correctly transmitted. For example, in chapter 4 there occurs the following passage: *Ataḥ Śāradvatīputra durlabhatamās te satvāḥ, ye gambhīrān dharmān śrutvā 'nuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayanti cchandam ca janayanti, mahākuśalamūlasamanvāgatāḥ. Nāhaṃ Śāradvatīputra tān satvān mahāsamsārasamprasthitān iti vadāmi, yeṣāṃ ayaṃ prajñāpāramitānirdeśaḥ śravaṇapatham apy āgamiṣyati* (Hikata: *yanti*), *śrutvā ca paṭhiṣyanti, adhimokṣayiṣyanti, udāram ca prītisaumanasyaṃ janayiṣyanti, eṣu dharmeṣu cchandam janayiṣyanti, punaḥ punaḥ śravaṇāyāpi. Kaḥ punar vadaḥ uddeṣṭuṃ vā svādhyātuṃ vā parebhyo deśayituṃ vā* (p. 59.11–18). The Tibetan translation agrees with the Sanskrit text apart from two minor differences:

1. *mahākuśalamūlasamanvāgatāḥ*, T. *dge-ba chen-po dañ-ldan-pa* = *mahākuśalasamanvāgatāḥ*; 2. *ayaṃ prajñāpāramitānirdeśaḥ*, T. *śes-rab-kyi pha-rol-pa 'di* = *iyam prajñāpāramitā*. The Chinese translation agrees with the first sentence up to *mahākuśalamūlasamanvāgatāḥ* and continues as follows: "I say that they possess great wholesome roots, are provided with great equipment (*mahāsambhāra*) and are armed with the great armour (*mahāsannāhasannaddhā*). Quickly they will realize the supreme and correct awakening (*anuttarasamyaksambodhi*). When these beings hear the exposition of this profound Prajñāpāramitā, they will rejoice and desire to hear it again and again. The merit reaped by them is without measure and without end. How much more (will be their merit) when they will be able to bear it in mind, to recite it and to teach it to others." The Chinese translation has certainly preserved the original text much better than the Sanskrit manuscript. The Sanskrit text makes a very clumsy impression and gives a distorted idea of the original version.

Probably *mahāsaṃsāra* is the result of a corruption of *mahāsambhāra*.

The editors and translators of the *Su.* have made many useful suggestions for emending the Sanskrit text, but many problems still remain.<sup>2</sup> In quite a few places the Chinese translation is based upon a much more reliable text. However, Hsüang-tsang's method of translating makes it difficult to make use of it for textual emendations. Nevertheless, it is certainly necessary to quote it each time when it seems to have preserved better the original sense of the text. A complete translation of Hsüang-tsang's version would be highly welcome. The following notes are limited to the discussion of a few passages only. For the Tibetan translation I have made use of the two editions at my disposal: the Peking and Lhasa editions of the Kanjur and for the Chinese translation I have used volume 7 of the Taishō edition (pp. 1065–1110). As the text is relatively short and moreover divided into seven chapters, I have refrained from giving references to page and line of the Tibetan and Chinese translations.

*Su. 5.6: nānapatrapānām. Ti ño-tsha ma-'tshal-ciñ khrel ma-mchis-pa rnam-s-kyi = nāhrīkānām anapatrapānām. C. agrees with Ti. Conze translates: "who discredit the doctrine by their deeds" and adds in a note: "Ch: who lack any shame and are without dread of blame". In MDPL Conze translates an-apatrapa by "one who discredits the doctrine by his deeds", but apatrāpya by "dread of blame".*

*Su. 5.19: -vr̥ṣabhōpamānām bodhisatvānām mahāsatvānām ābrīḍhaśalyānām. Ti does not have bodhisatvānām mahāsatvānām. These two words are to be found in line 22 and have to be omitted in line 19.*

*Su. 5.22–6.5: Ye dharmam api nopalabhante nābhiniśante, kutaḥ punar adharmam, teṣām vyaṃ Bhagavān arthāya Tathāgataṃ paripṛcchāmo bodhisatvānām mahāsatvānām āśayaśuddhānām . . . . . saṃśayacchedanakuśalānām, [teṣām] vyaṃ Bhagavan satvānām kṛtaśas Tathāgataṃ paripṛcchāmo bodhisatvānām mahāsatvānām. Hikata adds teṣām which is not in Ms. and in Ti. However, according to Ti one must put a full stop before āśayaśuddhānām and omit teṣām: bodhisatvānām mahāsatvānām. Āśayaśuddhānām . . . . . saṃśayacchedanakuśalānām vyaṃ Bhagavan satvānām kṛtaśas Tathāgataṃ paripṛcchāmo bodhisatvānām mahāsatvānām.*

*Su. 7.10: Apāramitaiṣā Suvikrāntavikrāmin sarvadharmāṇām, tenocyate prajñāpāramiteti. According to Hikata's note C. and Ti have pāramitaiṣā. However, C. does not translate pāramitā with the usual equivalent but gives a free rendering: "Wisdom is able to penetrate far into the true*

nature of the dharmas”. It seems preferable to read *pāramitā*, as in p. 27.3 where C. renders *pāramitā* in the same way (Hikata corrects the manuscript reading *ā pāramitā* to *pāramitā*. Conze reads *ā-pāram-itā* and refers to Ti *tshu-rol rtogs-pa ste*. However, *tshu-rol* corresponds to *āra* and not to *pāra*). In the following passage Conze corrects the readings of the manuscript: *ajñā* and *ajānanā* to *ājñā* and *ājānanā*. It is impossible to determine the original readings, but C. and Ti show clearly that the negative prefix *a* is incorrect.

Su. 7.17–18: *yatha satva ajānanas, tenocyate prajñeti*. Ti *ji-ltar sems-can rnam-s-kyis śes-par 'gyur-ba de-ltar śes-rab ces bya'o*. Cf. p. 27.4–5: *yathā punar yuṣmākam ājānanā* (Ms. *ajānanā*) *bhaviṣyanti*, Ti *ji-ltar khyed śes-par 'gyur-ba*. It is impossible to reconstruct the original readings.

Su. 8.1–3: [Na] *jñānagocara eṣa Suvikrāntavikrāmin nājñānagocarah, nājñānaviṣayo nāpi jñānaviṣayaḥ; aviṣayo hi jñānam; saced ajñānaviṣayaḥ syād, ajñānam syāt*. Hikata adds *na* which is found in Ti but not in C. Ti inverts the order of *jñānagocara* and *ajñānagocara*. According to Hikata Ti and C. do not have *saced ajñānaviṣayaḥ syād* but correspond to: *sacej jñāne viṣayaḥ syād*. However, C. translates: *sacej jñānam viṣayaḥ syād*. This follows logically after *aviṣayo hi jñānam*: “Knowledge is not the object (of knowledge); if it were the object (of knowledge), it would be non-knowledge.” *Eṣa* refers to *prajñā*. Conze translates *prajñā* by ‘wisdom’ and *jñāna* by ‘cognition’. His translation of this passage is as follows: “It [i.e. *prajñā*] is not the range of non-cognition, not the sphere of non-cognition, nor also the sphere of cognition; for it is a cognition without an (objective) sphere. If there were an objective sphere in non-cognition, that would be a non-cognition.” However, this passage only makes sense by assuming that *prajñā* and *jñāna* are used without making a distinction between the two: “It is not the domain of knowledge, nor the domain of non-knowledge, nor the object of knowledge, nor the object of non-knowledge. For knowledge [i.e. *prajñā*] is not the object (of knowledge). If knowledge were the object of knowledge (*sacej jñānam viṣayo syād*), it would be non-knowledge.”

Su. 8.4–5: *nājñānena jñānam ity ucyate, nāpi jñānena jñānam ity ucyate*. Ti *ye-śes-kyis ye-śes śes bya'o || ye-śes-kyis mi-śes-pa źes mi-bya'o ||* = *jñānena jñānam ity ucyate, na jñānenājñānam ity ucyate*, C. *nājñānena jñānam ity ucyate, nāpi jñānenājñānam ity ucyate, nāpi jñānena jñānam ity ucyate*.

Su. 8.6: *na tu tatra kiṃcid ajñānam, yac chakyaṃ ādarśayitum; idaṃ taj jñānam . . .* Read with Ti and C. *kiṃcij jñānam*.

Su. 8.7–8: *Tena taj jñānaṃ jñānatvena na saṃvidyate, nāpi taj jñānaṃ tatvenāvasthitam*. C. translates: “Therefore in knowledge there is no property of true knowledge and neither does true knowledge reside in the property of knowledge” (*tena jñāne jñānatvaṃ na saṃvidyate, nāpi jñānaṃ jñānatve 'vasthitam ?*). Ti *de'i-phyir ye-śes de-ni/ye-śes-ñid-kyis med-do || ye-śes kyañ ye-śes-su mi-gnas-te* = *tena taj jñānaṃ jñānatvena na saṃvidyate, nāpi jñānaṃ jñānenāvasthitam*. The instrumentals *jñānatvena* and *tatvena* or *jñānena* are predicate instrumentals<sup>3</sup>: “Therefore that knowledge does not exist as (true) knowledge, that knowledge is not established as (true) knowledge.”

Su. 8.11: *jñānājjñānaṃ yathābhūtaparijñā*. Read *jñānājjñānāyor yathābhūtaparijñā*, cf. Ti *ye-śes dañ mi-śes-pa yañ-dag-pa ji-lta-ba bzin-du yoñs-su śes-pa*. C.: “true and complete knowledge of knowledge and non-knowledge.”

Su. 8.12–14: *Na hi jñānaṃ vacanīyaṃ nāpi jñānaṃ kasyacid viṣayaḥ sarvaviṣayavyatikrāntaṃ hi jñānaṃ, na ca jñānaṃ viṣayaṃ, ayaṃ Suvikrāntavikrāmiṇ jñānanirdeśaḥ. Adeśo 'pradeśaḥ, yena jñānenāsau jñānināṃ jñānīti saṃkhyāṃ gacchati, yaivaṃ . . .* Hikata's punctuation is not correct because a full stop must be placed between *viṣayaṃ* (read *viṣayaḥ*) and *ayaṃ*, and the full stop between *jñānanirdeśaḥ* and *adeśo* must be omitted. *Na ca jñānaṃ viṣayaḥ*. Ti *ye-śes-kyi yul yañ gañ-yañ ma yin-no* = *na cāsti kaścij jñānaviṣayaḥ*. C.: “It can not be said that knowledge is the object of non-knowledge” (*na ca jñānaṃ ajñānaviṣayaḥ*). Hikata remarks that for *jñānināṃ jñānīti* Ti has *jñānyajñānīti*. However, even with these changes Ti does not correspond to the Sanskrit text: *phyogs kyañ ma yin-pa 'di gañ-gis śes-pa de ni | ye-śes-can nam | ye-śes-can ma yin-pa źes-bya-ba'i grañs-su mi 'gro'o ||*. Perhaps the original text read: *yena jñānena nāsau jñānyajñānīti saṃkhyāṃ gacchati*.

Su. 9.14–15: *nirvidhyati nirvedhikā prajñety ucyate, nirvidhyati*. Ti seems to have read: . . . *prajñā nordhvaṃ nirvidhyati*, cf. Ti *steñ ma rtogs-te*. C. is more detailed: “This penetrating wisdom does not exist at all, not above, not below; it is not slow, not quick; it does not progress nor regress; it neither goes nor comes”.

Su. 10.9: *saṃsārātyantavihārī*. Ti *drug-la rtag-tu gnas* “always remaining in the six”; C. “possessing the six permanent states”. Read *ṣaṭsātatyavihārī*? Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* p. 150.4: *ṣaṭ sātātā vihārā* and the references given by La Vallée Poussin *L'Abhidharmakośa*, III (Paris-Louvain, 1926), p. 114, n. 3.

Su. 10.13: *vajropamasamādhir nairvedhikyā prajñayā parigrhītaṃ*

*yatra sthāpayati*. Read: *vajropamaṃ samādhiṃ* (Ms. *vajropamaṃ samādhir*). Conze's translation has to be corrected, for *samādhiṃ* is the object of *sthāpayati* and *pracārayati*: "wherever he fixes his concentration and to which objects he directs it".

*Su. 10.19: tantraupayikayā* (Ms. *tatraupayikayā*) *mīmāṃsayā*. Read *tatropayikayā*, cf. Pāli *tatr'upāyāya vīmaṃsāya samannāgata* (*Vinaya* I. 70, 71; IV. 211; Aṅg. Nik. II. 35; III. 37, 113; IV. 265, 286, 332; V. 24, 27, 90, 338). Cf. *Daśabhūmikasūtra* (ed. J. Rahder), p. 61.15: *tatropagatayā mīmāṃsayā samanvāgato*; *Ratnagotravibhāga* (ed. Johnston), p. 23.7: *tatropagamikayā mīmāṃsayā samanvāgataḥ* (see *IJJ*, XI, 1968, p. 44).

*Su. 11.13–14: na tasya, yaḥ svabhāvaḥ sa svayaṃsaṃbhavaḥ*. Ti *de'i rañ-bzin de ni / rañ-gi ñaṅ-gis 'jig-ciñ*. Tosani reads: *tasya yaḥ svabhāvaḥ sa svayaṃvibhavaḥ*, but *yaḥ* is not represented in Ti. C. has: "In this way the *svabhāva* is destroyed by itself."

*Su. 11.14: samudayānantaranirodhaḥ*. Hikata remarks: "Ms. is not clear but looks like to be *-nuttara*<sup>o</sup>; acc. to Tib. also *-nuttara*<sup>o</sup>; but Ch. *anantara*; from the context of this paragraph, it should be *-ānantara*<sup>o</sup>". *Samudaya* is absent in both Ti and C. Ti: *mñam* (L. *sñam*)-*pa ni / bla-na med-pa'i 'gog-pa ste*; C. "it is immediate destruction".

*Su. 12.1: Anirodho nirodhaḥ pratītyasamutpādasyāvabodhaḥ*. Ti *'gog-pa dañ mi-'gal-ba; avirodho nirodhaḥ*. C.: *avirodho virodhaḥ*. Instead of *avabodhaḥ* Ti has read *anirodhaḥ* (*'gog-pa med-pa*) and C. *anubodha*. Cf. p. 13.14.

*Su. 12.15–16: Na kiṃcid anyad upalabhyate, idaṃ taj jñānavigama iti*. Instead of *idaṃ taj jñānavigama iti* Ti has: "apart from the *ajñānavigama* and the *jñānavigama*" (*mi-śes-pa dañ bral-ba dañ / śes-pa dañ-bral-ba 'di-las*). C. translates: "Because one knows in this way cognition and non-cognition and nothing else is apprehended, therefore it is called *ajñānavigama*".

*Su. 13.22–23: na ca punar dharmādharmasvabhāvena saṃvidyate*. Hikata remarks that C. agrees with S., but that Ti has *dharmo dharmasvabhāvena* (*chos ni chos-kyi ño-bo ñid-kyis*). Tosani follows Ti. Conze reads *dharmo 'dharmasvabhāvena*. C. has "Moreover, both dharma and adharma are without *svabhāva*".

*Su. 15.1: dhātuḥ saṃketena*. *Dhātuḥ* is not found in Ti and C.

*Su. 15.9: sarvadharmānubodha*. Both Ti and C. have read *buddha-dharmānubodha*.

*Su. 15.12: apūrṇatvaṃ tad apariniṣpattiyogena*. Read with Ti and C.

*apūrṇatvam apariniṣpattiyogena.*

Su. 15.15–16: *Tena tad.* Tosaki suggests reading *Naitad* but according to Ti one must read *te na* (*de ni . . . . . ma yin-no*). Instead of *te* C. has ‘the Buddhadharmas’.

Su. 16.17: *viparyantāḥ* is obviously an error for *viparyastāḥ*.

Su. 17.2: *Sarvā manyanā ’sārambaṇā.* Conze translates *sārambaṇā*. Tosaki corrects *manyānā* to *’manyānā*. Ti: *sarvā ’manyānā ’sārambaṇā* (*thams-cad rloms-sems med-la dmigs-pa dañ bcas-pa ma-yin-pa*), but C. seems to have read: *sarvā manyānā ’nārambaṇā*.

Su. 17.8–9: *vibhāvavitā hi tena satvāḥ sarva[sam]jñāḥ.* Hikata remarks that according to C. and Ti it should be *sarva[sam]jñāḥ* but Ti has *sat-tvasamjñā* (*sems-can-du ’du-śes-pa*) and C. *sarvasamjñā*. Read: *vibhāvitā hi tena satvasamjñā*.

Su. 18.1–2: *yasyāś caryā ’vabodhād.* Read *caryāyā ’vabodhād*, cf. Ti *spyod-pa gañ khoñ-du chud-pas*.

Su. 19.7–8: *Nātra bodhir na ca cittam, na ca bodhir upalabdhā, notpādo nānutpādas, tena sa bodhisattva.* Ti *de-la ni byañ-chub kyañ-med / sems kyañ med-do // gañ-gis sems-ñid dañ / byañ-chub dañ / skye-ba dañ / mi-skye-ba yañ mi-dmigs-pa de byañ-chub sems-dpa’ = nātra ca bodhir na ca cittam, yena na ca cittam, na ca bodhir upalabdhā, notpādo nānutpādaḥ, sa bodhisattva.* C. agrees with Ti, but does not translate *nātra bodhir na ca cittam*.

Su. 19.18: *sarvam jñānam.* Ti *thams-cad mkhyen-pa’i ye-śes = sarva-jñājñānam.* C. can correspond both to *sarvajñā* and to *sarvajñājñāna*, cf. Nakamura Hajime, *Bukkyōgo daijiten* (Tōkyō, 1975), s.v. *issaiichi* (p. 60).

Su. 20.1: *cittaprakṛtiṃ ca prajānanti.* Ti *sems-kyi rañ-b’zin yañ rab-tu mi-śes = na ca cittaprakṛtiṃ prajānanti.* C. agrees with S.

Su. 20.3: *bodhiprakṛtiṃ ca prajānanti.* Ti *byañ-chub-kyi rañ-b’zin yañ rab-tu mi-śes-te = na ca bodhiprakṛtiṃ prajānanti.* C. agrees with S.

Su. 20.3: *te nājñātacittena bodhiṃ ca paśyanti.* C. corresponds to: *te ’nena jñānena citte bodhiṃ na paśyanti.* C. does not translate *na bodhau cittam paśyanti, na citte bodhiṃ paśyanti* (p. 20. 4–5).

Su. 20.6: *te bhāvanām api nopalabhante.* Ti *de rnam-par ’jig-par byed-pa de yañ mi-dmigs-śiñ = te vibhāvanām api nopalabhante* C.: *te bhāvanām ca vibhāvanām ca nopalabhante.*

Su. 20.16: *Ye punaḥ Suvikrāntavikrāmin bodher nāpi dūre nābhyāsanne samanupaśyanti.* According to C. *bodher* must be corrected to *bodhim*.

Su. 20.25: *yo hi naiv'āram upalabhate. Ti gaṇ pha-rol ñid kyaṇ mi-dmigs.* Tosaki reads: *yo hi naiva pāram.* This is confirmed by C.

Su. 22.20: *anulomaṃ ca saṃdhayanti.* Conze translates: “they explain (their secret intent) in agreement with just the fact”. However, neither Ti nor C. support this explanation. Ti *rjes-su mthun-par smra-bar byed-do*; C. “they harmonize this and that so that there is no mutual opposition”. Probably one must read *saṃdhāyanti* as has been proposed by Matsumoto. According to Edgerton *dhāyati* and *dhāyate* (from *dhā-*) occur chiefly in comp. with *antara-*. C. is correct in translating *saṃdhāyati* by ‘to harmonize, to make agree’.

Su. 23.3–4: *na ca kaṃcid anurakṣyaṃ dharmam deśayati.* Conze puts a question mark after his translation: “Although he does not demonstrate any dharma which can be preserved”. Ti has read also *anurakṣyaṃ* (*rjes-su sruṇ-ba'i chos*), but according to C. one must read *kiṃcid anurakṣya*: “he teaches the dharma without holding back anything”.

Su. 25.1: *ratnānām api.* Read *ratnānām nāmāpi*, cf. Ti *rin-po-che rnam-s-kyi miṇ yaṇ*. C. agrees with Ti.

Su. 29.18: *Na hi Suvikrāntavikrāmin rūpaṃ rūpasvabhāvaṃ jahāti.* Ti translates *jānāti* (*śes-so*), but C. agrees with S. Also in line 19 Ti has *jānāti* but C. *jahāti*.

Su. 37.16: *nirvṛttir nānirvṛttiḥ.* According to Hikata C. has *nirvṛti* and *anirvṛti* but Ti agrees with S. However, Ti has *nivṛtti* (*ldog-pa*) and *anivṛtti* (*mi-ldog-pa*). In 41.5 Ti translates *nirvṛtti* with *grub-pa*.

Su. 41.16–17: *na ca svapnasvabhāvanirdeśaḥ kaścit saṃvidyate.* Ti agrees with S. but according to C. one must read: *na ca svapnasvabhāvaḥ kaścit saṃvidyate*.

Su. 42.3: *svabhāvanirdeśaḥ.* Read *svabhāvaḥ* (see Hikata note 1).

Su. 42.4: *māyāsvabhāvanirdeśasya svabhāvo.* Read with C. *māyāsvabhāvanirdeśo*.

Su. 42.19: *marīcinirdeśasvabhāvo.* Read with C. *marīcisvabhāvanirdeśo*.

Su. 43.2: *prajñāpāramitānirdeśapadam cādhiḡacchati śravaṇāya.* According to C. one must read: *prajñāpāramitā nirdeśapadam cādhiḡacchati śravaṇāya*.

Su. 43.2–3: *na ca kasyacid dharmasya nirdeśaśravaṇāya gacchati.* Conze translates: “it is not the exposition of any dharma which reaches the hearing”. Obviously, Conze reads: *nirdeśaḥ śravaṇāya*. Ti *chos gaṇ bstan-pa thos-par 'gyur-ba med-do*. However, C. has: “The dharma which is heard is entirely without *svabhāva*”: *na ca kasyacid dharmasya*



*svabhāvaḥ śravaṇāya gacchati.*

Su. 43.7–8: *kutaḥ punas tannirdeśasvabhāvopalabdhir bhaviṣyati. C.: “Why? The mass of foam does not exist, Suvikrāntavikrāmin. How much less will there be an exposition of its svabhāva”: Tat kasmād dhetoh! Phenapiṇḍa eva na samvidyate, kutaḥ punas tatsvabhavānirdeśo bhaviṣyati.*

Su. 43.24: *prajñāpāramitāyā nirdeśaḥ kāryaṃ ca karoti. C.: tasyā nirdeśena kāryaṃ ca karoti.*

Su. 45.10: C. adds *jantu* between *jīva* and *poṣa*, cf. *Kāśya pa parivarta* § 142. Likewise p. 47. 8–9.

Su. 47.1–2: *nāsyāṃ kaścīd upalabhyate yo ’bhisambuddhaḥ. (Ms. (’bhisambuddhā), Read with C. ’bhisamboddhā. Ti has nāsyāṃ kaścīd pariniṣpanno dharma upalabhyate yo ’bhisambuddhaḥ: gaṇ mñon-par rdzogs-par rtogs-pa yoṅs-su grub-pa’i chos gaṇ-yaṇ mi dmigs-so.*

Su. 47.21–22: *Paramārthajñānadarśanasamvṛtyasvabhāvato. C. adds jñānadarśana between samvṛti and asvabhāvato.*

Su. 52.22–23: *na kaṃcid dharmam upalabhate, na samanupaśyati, yaṃ dharmam jānīyād yasya vā dharmasya jñāpayitrā vā bhavet. Ti chos gaṇ śes-pa ’am / chos gaṇ śes-par byed-par ’gyur-ba’i chos gaṇ-yaṇ mi dmigs-so = na kaṃcid dharmam upalabhate yaṃ dharmam jānīyād yasya vā dharmasya jñāpayitā vā bhavet. C. agrees with Ti.*

Su. 58.6–7: *ca yeṣāṃ parijānante, te tathārūpāḥ satpuruṣāḥ. Ti gaṇ-gi (L,T,T. gis) yoṅs-su śes-pa de daṇ de-dag ni = ca yeṣāṃ parijñanam, te te. In the following lines read: , te te instead of te, te.*

Su. 61.2: *pariniṣpattir darśanenopayātaḥ. Read: pariniṣpattidarśanam upayātaḥ, cf. Ti yoṅs-su grub-par mthoñ-bar ñe-bar ’gro-ba ma yin-no. See also p. 61.3, 8, 9, 13 and 14 where the same emendation has to be made. Probably the instrumentals have crept into the text under the influence of the instrumentals in the preceding passage.*

Su. 62.24–25: *Asaṅgalakṣaṇ[eṣu] hi Śāradvatīputra [sajanti] sarvabāl-aprthagjanāḥ. Ms. Asaṅgalakṣaṇā. Read Asaṅgasāṅgā [or asaṅgasaktā] hi Śāradvatīputra sarvabālaprthagjanāḥ, cf. Ti byis-pa so-so’i skye-bo thams-cad ni / chags-pa med-pa la chags-so //. C. agrees with Ti.*

Su. 68.12–14: *yā ’pi sā ’yuṣmañ Śāradvatīputra prajñā lokottarā nirvedhagāminī, tasyā api prajñāpāramitānidarśanam nopaiti. Tosaki separates correctly prajñāpāramitā and nidarśanam. Conze omits tasyā in his translation: “It is because this is a wisdom which is supramundane and which leads to penetration that the perfection of wisdom does not lend itself to explanation”. Tasyā refers to prajñā. “As to prajñā, the per-*

fection of wisdom does not envisage the explanation of it (i.e. *prajñā*)” (“does not envisage the explanation” is Conze’s rendering of *nidarśanam upaiti* in the preceding passage).

*Su. 68.14–16: Tad yathā ’yuṣmañ Śāradvatīputra dharmo nidarśanam nopaiti kasyacid dharmasya, katham tasyaivodāhāranirdeśo* (Hikata *tasya evo-*, but Ms. *tasyaivo-*) *bhaviṣyati*. Tosaki omits *dharmo* but this is found both in Ti and in C., cf. Ti *chos gañ ñes-par bstan-par yañ ñe-bar mi-gro-ba’i chos de ji-ltar brjod-ciñ ñes-par bstan-par ’gyur*.

*Su. 71.12–13: na tathā yais te, te dharmā ye ca na tathā* (Ms. *’vitathā*) *yathā grhītās*. Ti: *chos de ni | ji-lta-ba bzin-du ma yin-no || gañ-dag ji-ltar bzuñ-ba de-bzin-du ma yin-pa*. C.: “Such dharmas are not so. As they are seized, not such are their marks.” Read: *na tathā yathā te te dharmā, ye ca na tathā yathā grhītās* (?).

*Su. 72.4: Sarvaiṣaṃ* (Ms. *sarveṣaṃ*) *Suvikrāntavikrāmin vikalpacaryā*. Ti. *rab-kyi rtsal-gyis rnam-par gnon-pa | ’di* (T.T. *de*)-*dag thams-cad ni | rnam-par rtog-pa la spyod-pa’o = sarvaiṣā . . .*

*Su. 72.5: sarvavikalpaprāhīṇā*. Tosaki emends to *sarvakalpaprahīṇā* in accordance with Ti. However, C. has *sarvakalpavikalpaprāhīṇā*.

*Su. 72.5–6: kalpa iti Suvikrāntavikrāmin vikalpanaiṣā sarvadharmāṇām*. C.: *kalpa iti kalpasvabhāvaḥ sarvadharmāṇām, vikalpa iti kalpaviśeṣaḥ sarvadharmāṇām*.

*Su. 73.7: yato*. Read *yad* (Ti *gañ*).

*Su. 73.11: nocyeta*. C. adds: *viparyāsa iti*.

*Su. 73.13: Jñāto* (Ms. *jñātaṃ*) *hi tena viparyāso ’bhūta iti*. The reading of the manuscript *jñātaṃ* must be kept.

*Su. 73.19: tena sārddham [a]viparyāsaḥ sthita*. Ti *de’i phyir de phyin-ci-log med-par gnas-pa = tena sa ’viparyāsasthita*.

*Su. 73.19: caryāyāṃ* (Ms. *caryā*) *na vikalpayati*. Read *caryāṃ na vikalpayati*.

*Su. 74.24: tena ca caryā-pagatā*. Ti *de spyod-pa med-pa ste = te caryā-pagatās*.

*Su. 78.18–19: pariñātā hi ten’ ātmasatvārambaṇaprakṛtipariśuddhā* (Ms. . . . -*ārambaṇapariñā*). Read: *prakṛtipariśuddham hi ten’ ātmasatvārambaṇaṃ pariñātam*.

*Su. 84.5–6: prajñāpāramitācaryā cittajanikā, tenocyate ’cintyate*. Ti *sems-kyis bskyed-pa* (T.T. *sems-kyi skyed-pa*) *ma yin-pa’i phyir-te | de’i phyir bsam-gyis mi khyab-pa zes bya’o = cittajanitā, tenocyate ’cintyete*. C. agrees with Ti but adds: *na ca cittajanikā, tenocyate ’cintyete*.

*Su. 84.7–8: cittam cittajam iti Suvikrāntavikrāmiṃś cetasaḥ pratiṣed-*

*ha eṣaḥ. Ti sems žes bya-ba de ni / sems rab-tu rtog-pa'o* (T.T. *gtogs-pa'o*) = *cittam iti. Suvikrāntavikrāmiṃś cetasaḥ prativēdha eṣaḥ*. C.: “Non-production of mind also is perverted view. If one understands that both thought and mental elements (*caitasika*) do not exist, then there is absence of perverted view.”

Su. 87.1: *Sarvalokābhyudayacaryeyam. Ti 'jig-rten thams-cad las mñon-par 'phags-pa = sarvalokābhyudgateyam*. For *sarvalokābhyudgata* see p. 122.7; *Lalitavistara* (ed. S. Lefmann) p. 60. 14; *Suvarṇabhāṣot-tamasūtra* (ed. J. Nobel), p. 206.6.

Su. 87.16–17: *Vaiśāradyabhūmir iyaṃ Suvikrāntavikrāmin dharmaneyam* (Ms. *dharmaneyam*) *prajñāpāramitācaryā. Dharmaneyam* is missing in both Ti and C. and has to be omitted.

Su. 88.10: *na kaṃcid dharmaṃ, yat prajñāpāramitāyāṃ na yojayati*. Read: *na kaścid dharmaḥ, yaṃ . . . .*

Su. 92.16–17: *phenapiṇḍopamā hi sarvadharmā avimardanakṣamatvāt*. Ti translates *avimardanakṣamatvāt* with *mñe* (L. *mi-ñe*) *mi-bzod-pa'i phyir = vimardana-a-kṣamatvāt*. C. has: “because they can not be picked up and rubbed”. *A-vimardanakṣamatvāt* means: “because they do not withstand crushing”. Conze translates: “because they are easily crushed”.

Su. 96.12–13: *tām api nirālambanavaśikatām na manyate*. Ti *dmigs-pa med-pa dañ / dmigs-pa ya-ma-brla de-dag la yañ rlom-sems-su mi byed-do = tām api nirālambanān ālambanavaśikān na manyate*. C. agrees with Ti. For *ārambanavaśika* see *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* p. 265. According to Haribhadra *ālambana-vaśika* means ‘depending on an *ālambana*’ (*ālambana-paratantra*). Conze translates ‘devoid of objective support’ (*The Perfection of Wisdom*, p. 175) but *vaśika* cannot have the meaning ‘empty’ as second member of a compound.

Su. 98.20–22: *Yāvat kalpanā tāvad vikalpanā, nāsty atra vikalpanāsamucchedaḥ. Yatra punaḥ Suvikrāntavikrāmin na kalpanā na vikalpanā, tatra kalpasamucchedaḥ*. Tosani emends *vikalpanāsamucchedaḥ* to *kalpanā-*. Ti has *mi-rtog-pa* which corresponds to *vikalpanā*. For both *vikalpanāsamucchedaḥ* and *kalpasamucchedaḥ* C. has *kalpanāvikalpanāsamucchedaḥ* which is certainly the original reading.

Su. 99.1: *anto hi Suvikrāntavikrāmin kalpo vikalpo* (Ms. *'vikalpaḥ*) *viparyāśasamutthitas*. Ti *rtog-pa dañ / mi-rtog-pa ni / phyin-ci log-pa las byuñ-bas med-pa'i phyir-ro = asanto hi Suvikrāntavikrāmin kalpo vikalpaś ca viparyāśasamutthitās*. Tosaki changes *anto* to *asan* but it is more likely that *anto* is the result of a corruption of *asanto*.

*Su. 100.7–8: dharmadānaṃ. Ti chos-kyi sbyin-pa la = dharmadāne.*

*Su. 101.20: duḥkhito vedanāttamanā. Hikata explains vedanāttamanā by Skt. vedanārtamanā and Pāli vedanāṭṭamanā. However, neither Ti nor C. translates vedanāttamanā and it is probably a corruption for 'nattamanā.*

*Su. 106.15: kāṅkṣāyitatvaṃ vā bandhāyitatvaṃ vā. For bandhāyitatvaṃ read dhandhāyitatvaṃ, cf. p. 22.17 and Edgerton, BHSD s.v. dhandhāyati.*

*Su. 114.10–11: āsanno bhavaty anavalokitamūrdhatāyāḥ. Conze reads avalokita- with a reference to Edgerton, BHSD avalokitamūrdhitā. Edgerton quotes only one place: Gaṇḍavyūha 65.18. The text of the Gaṇḍavyūha is incorrect and avalokitamūrdhitām must be corrected to anavalokitamūrdhitām. The Chinese translations of the Gaṇḍavyūha have a negation. See further Daizōkyō sakuin, vol. 5: kegon-bu (Tōkyō, 1963), p. 326c mukenchō, mukenchōsō; Nakamura Hajime, Bukkyōgo daijiten (Tōkyō, 1975), p. 1321c mukenchōsō; Bodhisattvabhūmi (ed. Wogihara), p. 381.3; (ed. Dutt), p. 263.3–4.*

*Su. 116.24: mahāsatvenārthaṃ. Read mahāsatvena sarvasattvānām arthaṃ, cf. Ti sems-dpa' chen-po sems-can thams-cad-kyi don. C. agrees with Ti.*

*Su. 117.21–24: Nāhaṃ Suvikrāntavikrāmin bodhisatvasya kaṃcid dharmam evaṃ kṣipraṃ paripūrikaraṃ samanupaśyāmi sarvadharmāṇām [an]yatheha prajñāpāramitāyāṃ yathā nirdiṣṭāyām abhiyogaḥ. Hikata changes yatheha to anyatheha. However, aparaṃ has to be added between kaṃcid and dharmam and sarvadharmāṇām has to be emended to sarvabuddhadharmāṇām, cf. Ti sañs-rgyas-kyi chos thams-cad myur-du yoñs-su rdzogs-par byed-pa de-lta-bu byañ-chub sems-dpa'i (T.T. dpa') chos gzan gañ-yañ nas ma mthoñ-ño; kaṃcid aparaṃ dharmam . . . . . sarvabuddhadharmāṇām yatheha prajñāpāramitāyām yathānirdiṣṭāyām . . . . . C. agrees with Ti.*

*Su. 120.7–9: iyaṃ mahāprthivī, meghān pratītya snigdhā bhavati, anupūrveṇa ca pravarṣati, devenābhiśyandamānā upary upary udakaṃ prav-arṣanti, yenotsadhiṃ (Ms. utsāhāṃ) bahavo 'nugacchanti. Read: . . . bhavati, anupūrveṇa ca pravarṣatā devenābhiśyandamānā, [meghā] upary upary udakaṃ prav-arṣanti, yenotsā bahavo 'nugacchanti (?). Ti char mthar-gyis bab-pas bañs-nas chu 'byuñ-ste gañ-du (L. gañ) chu-mig mañ-po 'byuñ-ba.*

*Su. 121.17: sarvā diśaḥ prabhā dhyāmīkaroti. Diśaḥ is not translated by Ti and C. Read: sarvāḥ prabhā.*

*Su.* 123.17–18: *asaṅgo 'saṅgatayā, saṅgo 'saṅgabhūtatayā*. Ms. *as-aṅgā asaṅgatayā, saṅgāsaṅgabhūtatayā*. Tosaki reads: *saṅgāsaṅgatayā, saṅgāsaṅgabhūtatayā*. Ti *chags-pa med-pa la chags-pa yañ-dag-pa ma yin-pa'i phyir* = *asaṅgasaṅgābhūtatayā*. C. reads: *saṅgāsaṅgatayā saṅgābhūtatayā*. For 124.1 *bandhābhūtatayā* C. has *bandhābandhatayā bandhābhūtatayā*.

*Su.* 123.20: *Abaddha iti*. Ti *rtogs-pa med-pa* translates probably *avedha* but according to the context and C. the correct reading must be *abandha* and not *abaddha*. *Abandha* corresponds to *asaṅga* (123.18). Moreover, a corruption from *abandha* to *avedha* is more likely than from *abaddha* to *avedha*.

*Su.* 126.9–10: *Teṣāṃ kulaputrāṇāṃ kuladuhitṛṇāṃ ca bhūyo mārebhyaḥ pāpīyobhyaḥ* (sic!) *'bhayaṃ* (Ms. *mārāḥ pāpīyāṃso bhayaṃ*) *pratikāṃkṣitavyaṃ*. Read: *na ca bhūyo mārāt pāpīyaso bhayaṃ*, cf. Ti *bdud sdig-can-gyis 'jigs-so sñam-du dogs-par mi bgyi'o*. A corruption of *mārāt* to *mārāḥ* has led to the change of *pāpīyaso* to *pāpīyāṃso*.

*Su.* 126.17: *Baddhasīmā Suvikrāntavikrāmin mārāṇāṃ pāpīyasām*. Read: *baddhā sīmā*, cf. Ti *bdud sdig-can rnam-s-kyi mtshams bcad-do*.

*Su.* 128.4–5: *vaistārikāṃ ca kariṣyanti*, [*te te manuṣye*] *ndrā manuṣy'ājāneyāḥ, parigṛhītās te*. Read: *kariṣyanti. Ye manuṣyendrā manuṣy'ājāneyāḥ, parigṛhītās te*.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts*, p. i,

<sup>2</sup> Several passages have been discussed by Conze in his reviews of the editions of the *Su.* by Matsumoto (*IIJ.* 2, 1958, pp. 316–318) and Hikata (*IIJ.* 3, 1959, pp. 232–234). His translation does not always follow Hikata's text. Tosani gives a list of corrections (pp. 316–315).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. H. Jacobi, "Über den nominalen Stil des wissenschaftlichen Sanskrits", *IF*, 14 (1903), p. 239 [= *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, p. 9]: "Es kann nämlich bei gewissen Verben allgemeiner Bedeutung das Prädikatsnomen durch den Instrumentalis seines Abstraktums wiedergegeben werden, wo wir im Deutschen gewöhnlich 'als' zu dem Prädikatsnomen setzen." See also L. Renou, *Grammaire sanscrite* (Paris, 1930), p. 293.